

**MINIMUM STANDARDS PRESCRIBED BY GOVERNING BODIES  
AND THE ASSOCIATED FLAWS WITH  
SPECIAL REFERENCE TO QUALITY EDUCATION**

**Avdhesh Jha**  
Editor, Voice of Research

**ISSN 2277-7733**  
**Volume 8 Issue 2,**  
**September 2019**

**Abstract**

*To add to the quality of higher education, there exists several autonomous bodies viz. UGC, NCTE, AICTE etc. Unfortunately, these days, these bodies have remained in lime light being dragged into newspaper and courts for several reasons. Along with these bodies came up the existence of NAAC and NBA and to add to it came up the NIRF. Noteworthy that the key positions of these autonomous governing bodies and even the universities which is responsible for escalating HEIs and its quality is influenced politically and thus their quality perspective and even its functioning remains questionable.*

**Keywords:** *education, quality education, UGC, NCTE, AICTE, NAAC, NBA, minimum standards, flaws*

It turns very futile when the system makes it compulsory (compulsion - when it is unessential or unrequired abducts the natural ethical instinct of the individuals who are uninterested in that act/action/activity) for any individual, college, institution or organisation to compete even when they know that they can't be compared. The abnormal comparison and its forcible application have created an abnormal competition which lead to the severe deterioration of the quality of education.

**API and Quality Perspective - Flaws**

To add to the quality of education, students and HEIs, the UGC came up with idea of converting the quality perspective in quantitative terms and thus came up with API. The birth of API with a good idea of quality was left upon the universities and other respective governing bodies to nurture and nourish based upon their understanding. API was implemented as a compulsion and was termed as a requirement for promotion and job. This compulsion, however was likely to deliver poor consequence and prove fatal. Enacting and enforcing the 2009 standards by the UGC, started the age of ISSN/ISSN. It's not wrong to move ahead and think ahead but merely with the application of the new rule, one cannot reject the older existence by applying the rule retrospectively. It means that the rule should be applied prospectively only from the date of its commencement and not retrospectively.

**ISSN/ISBN**

The lack of clarity of the application/implementation of the rule from the date of its commencement after its enactment and enforcement empowered the recruiting authorities to interpret it in their own way. The tragedy lies when the publication published before 2009 without any ISSN/ISBN is required to have the ISSN/ISBN. How amazing, the same publication, same title, same content, same author, same publisher but without ISSN/ISBN one cannot claim for associated score (a quality perspective associated with ISSN/ISBN) required in the name of API and the same was asked even for the publication before 2009 which existed since years.

Such vague rigidity of ISSN/ISBN through its vague interpretation and implementation seemed to prove as if the prospects need only the ISSN/ISBN irrespective of the quality and content. Since API score can be claimed only on the basis of ISSN/ISBN, it directly or indirectly insisted the authors and researchers to concentrate more on ISSN/ISBN rather than quality of publication and the publishers. In name of quality education and enhancement of quality of HEIs, the university authorities/recruiters poised the idea that that irrespective of quality, you can score and claim your API score only with ISSN/ISBN. This requires the rethinking of the requirements and a better understanding of the need and relevance of ISSN/ISBN. In most cases, the researchers and teachers desirous to publish, they simply ask, Is it ISSN journal? Does it have ISBN? In most cases these potential prospects didn't even knew which was used for books and which for journals? Such situations arose several questions. Whether, ISSN/ISBN or the publication is important? Shall API score be assigned for ISSN/ISBN or for publication? Can the recruiters ask for its retrospective effect means ISSN/ISBN for earlier publication? As of now, any publication whether it is by Maharshi Ved Vyas or by Tulsidas or Premchand, if it is without ISSN/ISBN, it's invalid to be considered for API, if they apply for the any teaching position in university/colleges of India. Had Gandhiji gone without ISSN/ISBN of his auto biography to these authorities, Only God can help!!

### **International Publication**

As if the ISSN/ISBN were less, no sooner started the era of International publication (a new quality perspective associated on with the term "International" and a new entrepreneurial opportunities) that being a criterion in API and each journal turned international. The situation turned tragic when the recruiters/authorities irrespective of quality of publication simply asked, Is it an International Publication? If yes, where is it written? And if you are able to show it written somewhere, you get your claim, irrespective of its quality and content. Surprisingly, even the local journals in local languages presented themselves as international and more surprisingly it was considered by the authorities. (Noteworthy that to publish a journal or book is not easy for any publisher. Where people are hardly aware of the report writing, research methods, how can one expect a publisher to publish something rich. He can publish that, what he gets. And quality is not a fruit to eat and get. Any quality, takes time to add to itself. Again to publish anything, it costs. Thus to sustain, the publisher need to charge, however care should be taken that it should be nominal subscription based charge. Everyone cannot do charity. Like recruiters, some believe in business and they do it. As a matter of fact, today there are no buyers of books and journal and if at all, they buy, only out of compulsion, as a requirement.) As if it was less, even a small pocket size booklet of about 10-12 pages in local languages were considered as publications in most of the interview. Since, UGC has no role in process conducted by the recruiters and that the recruiters had only to report the results irrespective of process carried out by them, such level of discrepancies was observed in understanding the minimum standards and norms laid by UGC in the name of quality education. The API as a quantitative conversion of the quality proved more than fatal because the recruiters and university authorities by their ways and techniques forced the teachers and job seekers to perceive that quality is expected through API score which is claimed and assured with mere ISSN/ISBN and the word "international".

This API with many components including the ISSN/ISBN, and the word “international” created a chaos in the name of quality enhancement. Writing a book or conducting a research is not everybody’s cup of tea and imposing and enforcing one to do that results with lots of publications but without any value because the prospects perceived that promotion required API and API required only ISSN/ISBN or the word “international”. The quality perspective turned tragic because many who couldn’t write but could pay, paid it and published and got the promotion, many who couldn’t write and couldn’t pay to get it written, just copied and gave rise to Plagiarism issue and thus the minimum standard of UGC and its poor interpretation enabled good business to software developers and trouble for teachers. It posits several questions - Are all teachers capable to conduct research? Can we have quality research by associating it with our promotion as well job requirement? Who is responsible for these plagiarisms? Who is responsible for this chaos?

### **Teaching/Research – What should be priority?**

Any school teacher or a college or university teacher has his first commitment to the students and then to the institution, Authorities, Parents, State and then to the Nation. Although we have highly qualified teachers in schools and colleges but yet we hardly have creativity and innovations. The reason is lack of thinking ability. The schools and colleges through their teachers and environment need to promote thinking ability, promote divergent thinking and thus add to the education, values, creativity and innovation. As soon as this skill is developed, research will be the natural outcome. Again, a good research requires full time responsibility and commitment, dedication and devotion. The quality research can’t come with the loaded responsibility of teaching in addition to the other responsibilities of job. Such a situation where all teaching, research, publications, awards, seminars, presentations, curriculum design, attending orientation and refresher courses is must for a teacher again posits some questions. Is it must for a teacher to do research? If yes, why? Do we have enough flexibility in the structured closed classroom environment to share and talk about the research? If yes, does our course curriculum include any element of contemporary research?

### **Seminar/Conferences**

With inclusion of the seminar and conferences as a part of API score, there was a boom for seminar and conferences but purely a vague one. Everyone made it a business. The hard earned money paid by the tax payers was abused like anything in the name of seminars and conferences with nothing more than to add to API and college grading. It was used only as a tool to collect the money by the organisers as well to collect the certificate by the prospects without any output of the seminars/conferences. Here also several questions arise? Shouldn’t the governing bodies lay a guideline as per the need of the time to assure about the topics of seminars and the conferences (make it unidirectional to find solutions of existing problems) and must ask for a valid report of the quality presentations? Had it been made directional and asked for reporting properly and sent to the think tanks, maybe we could have found solutions to many problems.

### **FDP/Orientation and Refresher Courses**

The FDP in the form of orientation and refresher courses also remained just a tool to add to the certificates and claim for API without any quality output of so many

mandays and human efforts put in. The UGC can just see how it has been conducted over the years with the same people as resource person with their same old topics which hardly added to the output else than adding to the number of certificates.

### **Library and Quality Perspective**

The sad part is today, hardly the students and teachers go to library. Most of the libraries have the books only to fulfil the numbers, whether 3000 or 5000 or so as per the statutory requirements, adhering themselves merely to numbers irrespective of quality and content of books and even the authorities just checking the numbers, most of which are useful only for children of age less than ten. Again, whether library or teachers, they hardly have the enough stuff for research to share and discuss with students but then too, proudly we talk of quality research, quality education and innovation. To be true there are hardly any classes with hardly any space for discussion. Further, we can talk of discussion, only if, we have both the students and the teachers in the class. The fact is that both are hardly available in the classrooms because most of the colleges have not filled the vacant positions and students needn't to come.

### **Appointment of Teachers in Colleges – Quality Perspective**

**Registrar certificate:** In the name of quality education and the quality of HEIs, the recruiters distorted the minimum standards to such an extent that from 2014, the advertisement for appointments of teachers asked each applicant to submit the letter from the registrar stating that their Ph.D. was done as per the 2009 regulations. Each advertisement asked for it in bold letters. Surprisingly, this was asked even from the candidates, who completed their Ph.D. before 2009 and in absence of submission, their candidature was rejected without any information to the applicant. Each university unanimously, interpreted, the rules in their own way to pave the ways for the special ones.

**N.O.C.:** Taking N.O.C. from any college/university especially in self-finance college is like giving a resignation without any assurance of any other job but then too the N.O.C. was must for any government job. These (Registrar letter and N.O.C.) were the guidelines which worked as a litmus test for the recruiters to eliminate most of the candidates based only on these two criteria. Even today, the institutes don't give the N.O.C. to their employees and don't support the employee as an applicant to certify the work done by them in that institute and asking for the same (although a right of employee) creates unhealthy relations between employee and employer. The height is that the institute doesn't promote the employee and if the employee wants to leave, it doesn't give the N.O.C. The poor salary structure, poor performance of teachers and students and high turnover ratio of teachers in any self-finance college is pure indicator of poor management and poor governance which remains to come in the jurisdiction of UGC and other governing bodies. Thus, the minimum standards for appointment no sooner turned the standard of flaws to serve the recruiters.

**Ph.D. tenure and Experience:** Out of the natural instinct for promotion, the teachers, over burdened with teaching responsibilities initiate their Ph.D. for promotion (Quality cannot come out of compulsory requirement) which is perceived as a social, economical and emotional promotion and in some cases maybe even mental promotion along with higher responsibilities. Atleast in self-finance colleges where Ph.D. is considered as personal development, any Ph.D. can be done only in

holidays or in the luxury and leisure time which hardly any teacher gets in self-finance colleges because at any point of time, there are only a few teachers that too at a meagre salary. (Needless to say, even today, when people talk about 7<sup>th</sup> pay, these teachers hardly get only the basic of 5<sup>th</sup> pay salary structure) these teachers don't have any right/freedom/luxury to ask for Ph.D. time. All they need to do is take leave or do it at the cost of salary. In most government colleges, it is allowed based on the extent of healthy relationship between the leader and the researcher. In such a painful, pathetic and poor situation along with the full time teaching responsibility, the teacher gets the Ph.D. Hereby the recruiters interpreted the minimum standards and expressed that the years spent for Ph.D. won't be counted as teaching experience. Again here the retrospective effect was considered to eliminate the potential candidates. It is more horrible because working in a self-finance college and then doing Ph.D. is not easy. The flexibility of interpretation of minimum standards posed a threat to many potential candidates throbbing for a better opportunity and they lost the permanent opportunity to apply for a particular position. The requisites for completing a Ph.D. although were good just remained a formality without adding to any quality. Infact, many universities spurred and made it a business providing only degrees and no quality outputs. Qualitatively, if we assess these Ph.D. theses, most of them are just nothing more than waste pf peper, time, money and energy. Wasn't it the duty of UGC to check about the quality of the outputs? Again, although the resources and the reach to the resources have increased rather than decreasing the number of years of Ph.D. the number of years keep increasing. It seems as if the candidate should keep on to study and study and study. Thanks that yet they remain to turn the graduation to four years and post-graduation to three years.

### **Multidisciplinary Research, Innovative Courses**

During this time, the UGC called for multidisciplinary research, innovative courses. Many enthusiastic scholars and teachers designed and conducted the multidisciplinary research and launched several innovative courses and on other hand the minimum standard for appointment of teachers said, "... should have a Ph.D. in the respective faculty..." "... Should have teaching experience in respective faculty..." Is it a Quality perspective? Does it mean associating with other faculties means no quality? These double standards implemented by the recruiters are the cause of death of creativity and innovation in society along with the loss of time, money, energy, hopes, aspirations, motivation ...

### **Double Standards**

Having a democratic approach, the UGC said X years' experience is required to be a Principal and then left it on NCTE to decide. The NCTE said Y years. Surprisingly the difference (X-Y) was five years and recruiters/employers used it as per their convenience. More surprisingly, earlier the minimum standards suggested that - to be a professor, it is must to be an associate professor, and now in 2019 anyone having experience of 10 years even an assistant professor can be a Professor (which is not followed by most recruiters today). Earlier anyone with X or Y years' experience could be a Principal, now suddenly the minimum standards suggested that it is must to be an Associate Professor to apply for the position of Principal and they added a tag, "... need to have the minimum scale prescribed for Associate Professor..." and it became the criteria to disqualify a potential candidate. How unscrupulous, the authorities

suggesting the minimum standards hardly ascertain, if the teachers are paid as per the scale but they have power to prescribe the same as a requirement which serves the recruiters to use it as elimination test thereby discriminating and taking away all the natural rights and instincts of the teachers working in self-finance colleges and then they expect quality education. We talk of quality education where most of the teachers (even today) are not getting even the 5<sup>th</sup> pay and yet most of them sign on the amount as per sixth pay or ... Where teachers cannot raise the voice for themselves, how can quality come? Quality needs leadership, advancement, sharing, healthy environment, moral and economical support. Expecting quality in existing situations is only a fantasy. No country can develop - whose teachers are so feeble and meek as to surrender to any unethical practice especially when it is related to their own survival.

### **Application Criteria**

As per the latest standards, it takes hours and hours, days and days with lots of stress to fill in the details to apply for any teaching position especially for a professor /associate professor. What more, they will ask for all details as such - when you appeared for SSCE? Which day? How many hours? Which school you studied? And many more vague and clueless questions which hardly has any relevance with that job. They ask to apply online with most problems (ofcourse without any solution) to be faced by the applicant and then ask to submit the hard copy without which your application is sure to be rejected. That is “online” and “Go Green”. Infact, the authorities, help the applicant to do the same job twice. The height of online application is when you apply for two positions on same platform and then too, you need to fill it twice, right from first to last. The minimum standards of UGC with maximum information and minimum useful content, without any standard platform for online applications and any standardisation of application format, results in wasting so many hours and days by the applicants who are stressed and fatigued filling the form and collecting documents for hope which is more likely to be rejected by the litmus tests followed by recruiters. Infact, these days, in the name of quality, recruiters, hire such people who can easily apply the litmus tests as per their needs. In absence of the standard form and standard platform, recruiters by distorting the details and asking more and more vague details stress the applicants so much as to drop the idea of applying for that position.

Although the university charges so much of money from each applicant, they command the applicants to look for their websites for any updates. The applicants keep surfing their websites without any results for months and months, needless to say, it is at the cost of research and effective teaching. The university has no duties and responsibilities towards the applicants to respond them by email personally. Although each applicant pays, before declaring that applicant ineligible, the recruiters least bother to let them know and ask for clarification. All they do is just upload it on website without details. In some situations, they turn generous enough to invite all the qualified and unqualified and then behave so gentle that each applicant is satisfied with the committee behaviour and ultimately they have the luxury to select the person (not having a single Ph.D. scholar) as a professor and that too in Central University.

### **Moral and Economic Loss**

In the name of quality education and in lieu of less number of teachers, giving advertisements turned a good business enabling the universities to collect money.

Many universities give the advertisements, collect the money and then declare, “the advertisement stands cancelled” without any idea of refunds of the money collected from the applicants. The UGC and the minimum standards... remains nowhere here and sets a good example for other universities to follow this pattern. All are not rich enough to afford this loss. Its not only economic loss but loss of hope, motivation, inspiration and aspiration as well.

### **Impact Factor**

The UGC added the tag of impact factor without any clarity of the agency responsible for impact factor. And so, started the era of impact factor and so started the agencies without any authenticity selling the impact factor. The teachers desirous to publish, simply used to ask, do you have impact factor? what is the impact factor? And a simple yes helped both of them to serve each other. The impact factor was the greatest tragedy introduced in this system. We cannot compare ourselves with the technology driven countries and its system. Where in, people hardly know about citation, hardly know to upload their papers, hardly have internet to use for educational cause, how can our journals have the impact factor? Again, impact factor, in no way ascertains the quality of papers published in the journal. Its more about reachability and access. Where people feel and have been taught to take the work of others publication and not to cite the same, how can any local journal have Impact factor and that too without a website and without uploading their papers? To add to the astonishment and chaos, UGC recommended heavy weightage to the impact factor and associated it with API ranging the score from 5 to 40 for a single paper, although they know, most papers are the papers written on table. It adds to the tragedy when a junior clerk is assigned the authority to check the authenticity of the claimed score of API by an applicant, and when the interview committee consists of the experts who hardly have any papers published in any Impact Factor journals and, in most cases, who just talk of impact factor without any knowledge of how it is calculated. The weirdness of minimum standards lies in understanding that any book publication from a foreign country get only 12 score and for a journal paper a score from 5 to 40 is assigned for a single paper which flourished the table work. As of now, hardly any Local journal is listed with Thomson Reuters (TR) and today we ask to publish in journals having impact factor by TR which takes years to list a journal. Is it a way towards quality?

### **UGC List**

As if these were less, the UGC came up with UGC list and suddenly all the quality journals, even with the bold tag of the terms like “ISSN”, “International” and “Impact factor” which till the date worked as a source to enable jobs to many candidates, suddenly, these valid journals, turned fake and vague. Again, without any clarity and so any recruiter/authority had the greatest freedom to ask for UGC listing of that journal although the publication might have been before the release of UGC List. It posed as if quality journal means UGC list as if UGC list and quality were synonymous. This UGC list was an addition to the recruiters set of litmus test. The vagueness of the UGC list was vested in the stress and efforts placed to list the journals published in French, Germany, scotish etc. languages. With a little hue and cry, UGC came up with the entire scopus list (copying the list – although the slogans of Make in India and Made in India existed) and the recruiters/authorities started

talking about “scopus” without any idea of what scopus is? Days passed and so passed the months and years and the effortive UGC kept on changing the list by another vague list, hardly applicable to any desirous researcher who would plan to publish. In 2017-18 it came up with a checklist to draw a new list of valid journals. The checklist with only the details about the website was hardly any way legible to find the merit of the journal or its papers which hampered all the merits of UGC. To be more precise, that checklist had no quality parameters by which the UGC claimed to have the quality research through that UGC list of journals. This gave ample opportunity to all the recruiters to play as they wanted and if checked properly, a big scam is likely to come out. These days, the UGC CARE is in existence which hardly has any care for any publisher or authors. This CARE is constituted but again there are some questions – How many members of core CARE committee are publishers or editors? Do they have enriched, innovative and creative publications? Are they acquainted with the problems of desirous scholars ready to get their papers published? Is the CARE acquainted with the problems of publishers? How many members of core CARE committee know the problems in publishing with any high impact factor journals? Without these answers, the CARE, can only move ahead with many steps to let start the struggle of the publishers and the potential authors willing to publish.

### **Expert from Industry**

The appointment norms stand really ridiculous when a person working as an associate professor lagging three months in his experience is not eligible to apply as professor and anyone else is selected as a professor in lieu of “person from industry” it sounds ridiculous because of the vagueness especially when there is no flexibility to insert the industry ideas in education. And it remains purely upon the discretion of the authorities to take a call as how to define a person from industry?

### **Ranking and Quality**

Whether it is school or colleges, only the students and teachers are suffering. The self-finance structure is being promoted but without any due care and equality by the system. The NAAC, NBA and NIRF promoted competition amongst the HEIs by all means. The same institute which is not ranked by NIRF ranks amongst the top in the state list? How ridiculous about the ranking! The difference in ranking by the state and national agencies disclose the severe differences in the ranks and ranking norms as well establish the fictitiousness of the system. Then the question arises – if it is so, why ranking? Should we have some standards for ranking or any agency can ask for any details and based on it (without any verification) can give the rank? Is it quality? Can quality be ascertained this way? What is the purpose of ranking – to sing the song of fake glory or to let the people take a healthy decision for the appropriate selection of college and university and attract the foreigners? As a part of quality perspective, here it seems as if the ranking agencies need to be ranked first and trained about how to rank.

### **Patents**

These days the Patents are in light. Although the number of patents are increasing and the related score is claimed but there are hardly any patents with its actual ability to be turned for economical gains for the creator as well its utility to the people. Is it a way to quality or a way to add to numbers? How pity, innovation without any application



but than too, patenting is promoted at the cost of money, time and energy which could have been utilised effectively otherwise.

### **Recent Situation**

#### **Time consuming process and frequent changes**

With reference to the latest minimum standards of appointments, each application has turned more than a problem. Each application costs so many man-days which are merely a waste and a stress for an applicant with wastage of paper, time and energy. In a recent application, they have asked for all and every information, most of which are not at all relevant. You are not given a choice to skip because without it the online platform doesn't allow you to move ahead. At a later stage, they can ask for form 16 also. And then after 6 months one fine day the university shall place the data online stating that out of 25 applicants, 20 having their API ranging between 600-900 are rejected because either they have not submitted the documents or ... and the selected list has only 5 candidates with highest API score 232 to be applied for position equivalent to professor. In advertisement seeking application for the position of Professor they said as per the UGC standards and later they asked, minimum qualification is Associate Professor. Is it following the standards? The recruiters strive more to look in the application as to find the ways to eliminate or disqualify the candidate. Its something amazing that the quality lies with 232 score and not with 600-900 score. Maybe, there is some deficiency but can't it be looked into? The authorities have power to consider someone as industry people and select as professor but here, its matter of quality!! The quality perspective is expected from the people who hardly know education but are good at other networks.

#### **Adding to the Differences in Faculty**

Each subject is related with other. They have correlation. The experience of a teacher in any faculty can be very well used in other faculty also because every teacher has his own ways. Over and above that a teacher is not only too teach the bookish material, he has to promote thinking skill, promote divergent thinking, develop higher order thinking skills and add to values along with preparing for realistic life. The transfer of training can be used effectively to add to the quality. But in the minimum standards... it is just restricted and thus such applications are merely cancelled by recruiters although the payment is accepted by recruiter. How if the framers of minimum standards could understand that teaching is not only content teaching but it involves adding to thinking skills, divergent thinking and open environment irrespective of the faculty and required degrees. How pity! You can invite some economics professor to education class but you cannot apply for appointment as economics professor.

Like UGC, now the NCTE, full of flaws has come up to certify the certificate of the degree holders each for INR 200. They can't stop the fake (so called) colleges but can certify the degree on chargeable basis (and create more chaos because maybe they think unless there is chaos, their existence is endangered). Why should anyone pay 200 INR for each certificate when the university already certifies the degree? Does it mean most institutes are running without recognition from governing bodies? And if so, why? What did the related governing bodies do to curb it?

With the declaration of Start up India, the enthused AICTE, as an initiative formulates the nodal team at national level comprising of the members who hardly had any start up. Is it the way to promote Start up India- the best proposed policy?

Can we get quality like this? Can we have industry support with such initiatives of AICTE? NCTE without any information, withdraws the recognition of a college which was considered fit till today. If so, why were they allowed to run it till the date? What about the mental and moral loss the students and also the teachers suffered in these institutions? Is it a quality perspective?

The NAAC, NBA, NIRF and state promoted unhealthy competition among HEIs with ambiguity in their rankings. How ridiculous about the ranking! Rather than improvement in quality of Higher Educational Institutions the quality has just turned a menace. The socio-economic-political system categorizing the people on the basis of birth, caste, custom, religion, mother tongue, nationality, SES, ability, power and other “isms” can hardly pave the path for quality and quality education.

### **Conclusion**

The UGC, IQAC cell, NCTE, AICTE, NIRF, NAAC, NBA, UNIVERSITIES together have hardly strived to ensure the benefits of potential prospects and education. In last ten years these governing bodies which should have worked as a safest corner because of their negligence have posited themselves as a terror. Else than increasing the number of colleges and universities, there is hardly anything they have added to the education. Needless to say, quality hardly ever comes with quantity. These governing bodies helped the cheats (running institutes without recognition from associated authorities) to flourish by not taking any action against them. When someone is misleading the society, why shouldn't he be stopped by associated authorities? At this point, all that, the governing bodies do is, they just come up with a warning to the public (as a small slide on website) or a public notice (on website). Why not stop them before they create a menace? Noteworthy, that in this competitive world, the needy never sees the warnings or notices. Every morning, we are afraid of newspaper, fearing the UGC will come up with something haphazard because of which the HEIs and the potential prospects will remain the sufferer. Whether, ISSN/ISBN, International journal, impact factor, UGC CARE, scopus, ABDC or the appointments and the associated scoring in form of API or other, in last 10 years and even today, the flaws in minimum standards and regulations have created huge losses to many. The related authorities have played well with it to distort it and use it for their sake. Again, here the question arises. Who is responsible for this chaotic situation? Is UGC related only with the reporting of results and not with process? Is it fair to ask for peer review or UGC listing of a journal for the publication which was done before the release of this list? Is such retrospective query of the authorities and their litmus test ethical? Who is responsible for the sufferings undergone by the potential prospects? Who is responsible for the opportunity loss? Who is responsible for the economic losses suffered by the innocent applicants who start applying with the advertisement? Are these governing bodies only to create chaos or to give solution? As on date also, with so many vacancies, a lot is going on, most of which is unethical. Can we have quality education like this? Can the meagrely paid teacher-whether in schools or in colleges be expected to be qualitative? Is there any responsibility of the governing bodies to curb this practice or they just keep busy to keep the potential prospects busy filling the forms for 60 hours and then asking for last salary slips or Form 16? If the UGC cannot check and assure the salary paid by institutes, how can it ask for the same for any appointment? Why should the

prospects pay for the negligence of these governing bodies? They can't stop the fake (so called) colleges but can certify the degree on chargeable basis (and create more chaos)? Why should the prospects pay 200 INR for each certificate when the university already certifies the degree? Does it mean most institutes are running without recognition from governing bodies? And if so, why? What did the governing bodies do to curb it? Rather than listing of the journals, the UGC should strive to curb such wrong practices.

Quality is neither a word nor a slogan. It requires strong and unidirectional efforts with standard practice to create a healthy environment. The classroom has teachers who can't raise voice for his rights. How can he provide the country with good leaders? Needless to say, leaders are created, nurtured and nourished in the classrooms only and then they are prepared to lead the society.

Days are not far, if the governing bodies behave abruptly, no one will seek admission. Already there are institutions who perform well without any recognition and the multinational companies hardly see the recognition by governing bodies. They see the talent, which the students have along with the grade sheet. This poses some more questions. Why do we need governing bodies? How do they add to quality education? Does the degree certificate from a university or a recognised body add to the quality education? Although most of the colleges are recognised by these governing bodies, there are hardly any facilities and only a few teachers to teach. Then how does the quality come? What did the governing bodies check in their inspection? Will the quality, quality education, creativity, innovation and others come only through recognition by governing bodies? There is other side also which shows that the best teachers praised by the students hardly have any valid professional degree validated by any governing bodies. Whereas in these institutions, although degree exists, there is hardly any quality and praise because of over loaded work, meagre salary, closed environment and lack of enthusiasm. Before, people start thinking alike and posing such questions, governing bodies need to awake.

Had these governing bodies worked and functioned properly none of the important institutions would have been in court rather we could have had quality research and quality education. Whether it is TAT or TET at school level or the NET/SLET at college level; when the universities cannot ascertain the teaching potential of a candidate over the years of teaching and learning process, how can these tests ensure to the quality teaching? Why should an individual give so many tests? Why aren't we conducting one such test that helps us to take valid decision at once and thus help us save time money and energy. It seems its merely taking away even a few rupees from the pockets of the job seeker and render them completely helpless. The vaguely presented minimum standards and its clauses and subclauses are interpreted as per the convenience of recruiters at the cost of quality. Asking for ISSN/ISBN, international, Impact factors and its Retrospective queries were the worst interpretation (by the authorities) of the vaguely presented clauses in the minimum standards. It seems as if the minimum standards (in true sense minimum) hardly had any standard which demands UGC to standardize the minimum standards and the present it. We talk of online application and progress in technology then why it takes so much time to fill a form? Will quality come by spending time, like this? Can't UGC prepare a platform for all HEIs and Teachers to have their own account which they can update regularly

and for any advertisement, with a click anyone can fill any form within no time. Isn't it required? Isn't it possible?

Past is a history and we need to learn from History. Still quality can be accomplished provided we come out of these flaws, poor standards and its poorest interpretation. A lot flaws have been created which needs to be stopped with clarity. With formulation, enactment and implementation of any new rule, it is necessary to clarify the date of its application with a clear clarity to avoid retrospective queries. Teaching is a passion and so is research. It demands the individual's duty orientedness, his responsibility, dedication, devotion, commitment, love and affection for his work and the potential prospects. The success of such people lies in the success of their potential task/prospects. They are the one who take the failure of their task/prospect as their failure and thus place their whole hearted effort for the success of the task/prospect which in true sense adds to leadership and quality. One should understand that Quality is not only a perspective, it is a path and the path can be followed only step by step. It necessitates, avoiding the jumps and twists. It may be tough but the path should remain smooth and clear without any ambiguity. To enhance quality, it is must that due care be taken by the governing bodies to check, ascertain and assure the institutional environment; adherence and following of the norms and standards neutrally; following the procedures of appointments and teaching learning process; assigning right job to right person in a right way with full clarity of his responsibilities, duties and authorities; assuring the timely salary and the salary structure of staff as well their timely promotion by the respective local authorities. Any loophole at any step causes dissatisfaction which affects the quality severely and hence the society. At this juncture when the UGC is drafting the new policy, this article is presented with a hope to let the authorities think and design the new regulation appropriately to avoid any ambiguity. I hope, these governing bodies wake up soon and come out of these standards and ponder in real sense for quality teaching and quality research without mixing it. Only then are the chances for the quality to prevail.